Remarks

Claims 1-11 have been rejected and the drawings have been objected to.

In response to the claim rejections arguments have been provided and the claims have been amended.

In response to objections to the drawings, new, amended drawings have been submitted that lack objected to numbering.

Reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

In response to an objection that Figure 2 and Figure 8 contain improper reference characters, corrected drawing sheets have been provided. Removal of the objection is requested.

REJECTION ON DOUBLE PATENTING GROUNDS

On page 3 of the office action, the claims have been provisionally rejected on alleged double patenting grounds under 35 U.S.C. §101. Applicant notes that claims in the other application are pending and will address this potential issue when claims are allowed from either application. Applicant further notes that claim one, which was identical to claim 1 of the other application, has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim an embodiment of the invention, and no longer recites the same words as claim one of the other application.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Shimizu. Applicant notes that Shimizu shows and describes (in the abstract) alternative control signal transmission paths. On the other hand, pending

claims 1 and claims dependent thereon recite two or more power circuits (not lower current control circuits that control power circuits). While Shimizu does show or describe (in the translated abstract) two or more control circuits, Shimizu does not show or describe (in the abstract) two or more power circuits. Instead, one power circuit is shown in the figure of Shimizu, while the Shimizu abstract mentions multiple control circuitry.

In this context, applicant points out that original claim 1 recites "two or more electromagnetic circuits." Such power circuit interactions, and particularly the existence of multiple power circuits that may interact, is not described in the abstract of Shimizu, or the other references. In order to particularly point out and distinctly claim this feature, claim one has been amended by the addition of "provide power to the at least one or more motor and/or generator."

Claims 5 to 11 have been amended by addition of the phrase: "wherein the at least one motor is an adaptive electric machine comprising two or more electromagnetic circuits that provide power to the at least one motor, and the two or more electromagnetic circuits are sufficiently isolated to substantially eliminate electromagnetic and electrical interference between the circuits." As described above, none of the references, either alone or in combination describe separate power circuits that are independently isolated with regards to electromagnetic and electrical interference. Such separate power circuits are now recited in these claims. Reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Reconsideration and allowance are requested because none of the references describe or necessarily include the element of substantial lack of electromagnetic and electrical interference between two or more power circuits, as recited in amended claims 1-11.

In view of the foregoing, and in summary, claims 1-11 are considered to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended, respectfully is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of all objections and rejections and issuance of a notice of allowance. The Examiner courteously is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for applicant at 202-912-2195 for any reason related to the advancement of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 10, 2005

Marvin Motsenbocker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 36,614

Heller Ehrman LLP
1717 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3001
Telephone: (202) 912-2000
Facsimile: (202) 912-2020

Customer No. 26633